



# WARTBURG AAUP

"Committed to Academic Excellence"

## NEWSLETTER

March 7, 2001

### NEW JOINT REPORT PROVIDES GUIDELINES FOR TENURE EVALUATIONS

The American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and the United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group (UE) in December released guidelines for conducting tenure evaluations. The report, entitled *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators*, provides practical suggestions aimed at helping colleges and universities improve their tenure processes and ensure that their policies and procedures are fair.

The practical suggestions for the tenure evaluation process contained in the report fall into four major themes:

- \***Clarity in Standards and Procedures for Tenure Evaluation.** Institutions must ensure that their stated criteria for tenure match the criteria actually used in practice. In addition, department chairs and other responsible administrators should clearly communicate the criteria to tenure-track faculty members early in their careers at an institution. Schools also must develop procedures for handling unexpected information they receive on an individual, either negative or positive (such as the acceptance of a book for publication or harassment charges), in the middle of a tenure-review process.
- \***Consistency in Tenure Decisions.** Tenure decisions must be consistent over time among candidates, regardless of their race, gender, age, disability, and national origin. In addition, formal evaluations of a single individual over time should reflect a coherent set of expectations and a consistent analysis of the person's performance. The report notes that a negative tenure decision should not be the first criticism the individual receives.
- \***Candor in the Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty.** The department chair and other responsible administrators should in clear terms explain to all tenure-track faculty members the standards for reappointment and tenure and the cycle for evaluation of progress to meet requirements. Periodic evaluations of faculty should include examples of quality performance by an individual as well as constructive criticism of areas where improvement is needed and practical guidance for future efforts.
- \***Caring for Unsuccessful Candidates.** Faculty and administrators are reminded to treat the unsuccessful tenure candidate with professionalism and decency. The report contains a checklist for dealing with the unsuccessful candidate and stresses that assisting this individual to relocate to another position benefits both the candidate and the institution.

The report also suggests that institutions provide opportunities for faculty, academic administrators, and legal counsel to collaborate on the development of the tenure evaluation process and that workshops on the appointment and evaluation of tenure-track faculty be held on campus.

"The courtroom can be a very uncomfortable place for academics," said Ann H. Franke, vice president for education and risk management, UE Insurance (and former AAUP associate counsel). "With clear evaluation criteria and procedures, college and university leaders can best explain their highly nuanced judgments on tenure to a lay jury."

The report, "Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators," is posted in PDF format on the ACE Web site at <[www.acenet.edu](http://www.acenet.edu)>.

**CHRONICLE SOUNDS ALARM ON PRESIDENTIAL SALARIES AT PRIVATE COLLEGES**

According to the November 24 *Chronicle of Higher Education*, there are 74 private college presidents who earned more than \$300,000 in 1998-99, the most recent year for which figures are available. The highest-paid president was Harry C. Payne of Williams College, who made \$878,222 in salary and benefits. But there were 61 presidents who raked in more than \$300,000.

Not surprisingly, compensation is higher for presidents at Research I and II institutions, where the median salary for 1998-99 was \$393,288. Next highest are the salaries at Doctoral I and II schools, where the median was \$218,703. At the Master's (comprehensive) I and II institutions, the median was \$160,396. And at Baccalaureate I institutions, where Wartburg is listed, the median presidential salary was a bit higher, at \$194,640.

The *Chronicle* article states that "the rate at which presidential salaries is climbing alarms some observers, who question whether colleges are thinking—and acting—more like big corporations than academic institutions." But the article also notes that the biggest salaries in private higher education are not paid to college presidents (or to coaches), but to medical school faculty and administrators. In 1998-99, the highest salary in American higher education—\$2.8 million—was paid to John P Wynne, Jr., who retired that year as chief financial officer for the University of Pennsylvania's Health System. The next highest-paid university employee in 1998-99 was James A. Grifo, a professor of obstetrics and gynecology at NYU, who made 2.2. million.

Compared to these rates of compensation, administrative salaries at Wartburg are quite modest, with presidential salaries well below the median for Liberal Arts I institutions. Here are the salaries for Wartburg's presidents and five highest paid employees as published in the November 24 *Chronicle*:

	<u>97-98 pay</u>	<u>98-99 pay</u>
John R. Ohle, president .....	—	\$137,500
Robert L. Vogel, president.....	\$151,467	\$45,597
Michael Book, VP, administration and finance .....	—	\$87,796
Alexander F. Smith, VP, student life .....	\$80,062	\$82,796
Alvin B. Koeneman, VP, development.....	\$64,930	\$73,980
Fredric A. Waldstein, professor, political science .....	—	\$71,948
Donald Juhl, director, food service.....	\$64,275	\$66,363

**WARTBURG AAUP ADDRESSES REGENTS ON PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION**

In a letter dated March 5, 2001, the executive committee of Wartburg AAUP wrote the executive committee of the Board of Regents, on behalf of the chapter, to recommend that faculty be involved in the normal periodic evaluations of the college president.

The letter begins by stating that this "recommendation was not actuated by any concerns about President Ohle's performance. On the contrary, it is precisely because relations between faculty and administration are presently amicable that our members feel that they can offer this suggestion without fear of its being interpreted as in some way adversarial."

As a basis for the recommendation, the letter refers to the principle of shared governance enshrined in the 1966 *Statement on Government of College and Universities*, which was jointly formulated by the AAUP, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB).

As indicative of how shared governance should operate in the realm of administrative evaluation, the authors cite the following passage from AAUP's 1981 statement on *Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators*:

Institutions should develop procedures for periodic review of the performance of presidents and other academic administrators. The purpose of such a periodic review should be the improvement of the performance of the administrator during his or her term of office. This review should be conducted on behalf of the governing board for the president, or on behalf of the appointing administrator for other academic administrators. Fellow administrators, faculty, students, and others should participate in the review according to their legitimate interest in the result, with faculty of the unit accorded the primary voice in the case of academic administrators. The governing board or appointing administrator should publish a summary of the review, including a statement of actions taken as a result of the review.

The writers particularly emphasize the fourth sentence: "Fellow administrators, faculty, students, and others should participate in the review according to their legitimate interest in the result, *with faculty of the unit accorded the primary voice in the case of academic administrators*" (italics added).

They also point out that there is a tradition at Wartburg of involving faculty in administrative reviews and refer to the evaluation of President Vogel in 1994, last year's review of Dean Menzel, President Vogel's three evaluations of Dean Pence, and the upcoming evaluation of the associate dean.

The letter concludes by stating, "These are exciting times for the Wartburg community, times of rapid and exhilarating change. However, among those things that we hope will remain unchanged is the spirit of mutual respect, cooperation, and openness that have characterized relations between the Board of Regents, administration, and faculty. It is in that spirit—and for the sake of the college's continued excellence—that we respectfully offer the recommendation contained in this letter."

#### **GOVERNING BOARDS GROUP URGES FACULTY MEMBERSHIP ON BOARD COMMITTEES**

The Association of Governing Boards has recommended that representatives of campus constituencies be granted membership on board committees. The AGB's 1998 *Statement on Institutional Governance* asserts that "faculty, student, and staff involvement in the work of the [governing] board most appropriately occurs by [non-voting] membership on standing or ad hoc committees of the board." In a rather striking acknowledgement of the importance of shared governance, the statement goes on to concede that even the granting of committee membership "neither constitutes nor substitutes for full communication and consultation with these stakeholders."

#### **FRC WITHHOLDS TITLED FACULTY PROPOSAL**

In a January 19 memorandum to the president, the Faculty Review Committee announced its decision not to put forward for faculty consideration its proposal to amend section 2.1.1.2 of the faculty handbook. The purpose of the amendment was to encourage a policy of making all new full-time faculty appointments tenure-track, except in cases where the need for the position was temporary. Only in these cases would titled appointments be offered.

According to the memorandum, the proposal was withheld because it had not obtained administrative support. While reserving the right to resubmit the proposal at a more propitious time, the committee urged the administration and appropriate faculty committees, in the meantime, to begin following handbook policy regarding the determination of teaching equivalencies (in section 2.5.2.6.3), which are supposed to establish whether a position is classified as full-time.

According to its December report to the faculty, FRC had offered the following argument in support of its proposal:

- The fundamental problem is that the titled category has become a catch-all for a large and disparate assortment of appointments. Its size casts doubt on the depth of the institution's commitment to the tenure system; its disparate nature makes the designation "titled" rather ineffective as a means of classifying faculty positions.
- The catch-all nature of the classification serves to blur the boundaries that should divide faculty, staff, and administrative roles in shared governance. The committee subscribes to the widely observed principle that curricular decision-making functions best when the chief participants are the teaching faculty.
- The benefits and burdens of faculty status are not distributed equally between the titled and ranked categories, nor within the titled category. It is the committee's opinion that all long-term, full-time faculty appointments should exist upon the same basis, and involve the same rights and the same responsibilities.
- In the view of FRC, the best way to resolve some of the inequities within the faculty classification system—and to improve its clarity and usefulness—would be to follow a policy of offering tenure-track appointments whenever long-term institutional need has been established.

- Although the immediate impact of this proposal would be negligible, the long-term effect would be as follows: over a period of years, as vacancies occur or new positions are added, a number of titled faculty positions—especially in the library and in the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Athletics—would be converted either to ranked faculty (i.e., tenure-track) or to administrative staff appointments.

The December FRC report also notes that the administration had registered its agreement with the proposal “in principle” and had actually initiated changes to particular appointments in the spirit of the proposal. Nevertheless, President Ohle had indicated that his administration could not support its adoption by the Board of Regents because it too severely restricted the college’s flexibility.

#### **PERCENTAGE OF “COMMITTEE” AND “AT-RISK” MATRICULANTS HIGHER THAN NORMAL**

According to the Office of Admissions, the proportion of “committee cases” within this fall’s entering class is 16.5%, more than two points higher than the nine-year average of 14.4%. And, according to the Office of the Registrar, the percentage of “at risk” students (see explanation below) within the entering class is 18.1%, a figure significantly higher than the five-year average of 16.4%.

High school students who apply for admission to Wartburg College are automatically accepted if their ACT composite score is 19 or above *and* if they rank in the top half of their high school class. Applicants who score below 19 on the ACT *or* whose class rank falls below the 50th percentile are either denied by the Director of Admissions outright or referred to the Admissions and Scholarship Committee. The Director of Admissions is authorized to reject applicants whose ACT and/or class rank are seriously deficient; only marginal cases are typically referred to the committee.

The committee reviews these so-called “committee cases” to determine whether or not they will be admitted despite their falling below admissions standards. The committee tends to accept the majority of these cases, although most of those accepted end up not enrolling. (In 1998, for example, the committee reviewed 262 cases and accepted 187, of which 66 ended up matriculating. In 1999, the committee reviewed 252 and accepted 180, of which 71 matriculated.)

The first three columns in the table are based on data gathered by the Office of Admissions and show, from fall 1991 to fall 2000, the total number of students in each incoming class (No. in Class); the number of matriculants in each class who were committee cases (No. of Committee Case Matriculants); and the percentage of that class which consisted of students who were committee cases (Cases as Percent of Class).

The fourth column (No. of “At-Risk” Matriculants) is based on data from the Office of the Registrar and shows, from fall 1995 to fall 2000, the number of matriculants whose ACT or final class rank fell below the standards set for admission. Most, but not all, of these matriculants were committee cases. Presumably, those who were not committee cases were applicants who, when accepted, exceeded the ACT and class rank standards, but fell below by the time they enrolled (most probably by moving down in grade point and therefore in class rank). It should be noted that the number of “at risk” matriculants has been fairly consistent with the number of committee cases—that is, until this fall.

FALL	No. in Class	No. of Committee Case Matriculants	Cases as Percent of Class	No. of “At-Risk” Matriculants	Percent of Class
1991	381	49	12.9%	—	—
1992	375	36	9.6%	—	—
1993	345	49	14.2%	—	—
1994	316	35	11.1%	—	—
1995	358	58	16.2%	58	16.2%
1996	406	69	17.0%	71	17.5%
1997	383	51	13.3%	52	13.6%
1998	406	66	16.3%	66	16.3%
1999	411	71	17.3%	70	17.0%
2000	491	81	16.5%	89	18.1%
<b>average:</b>	<b>409.2</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>14.4%</b>	<b>67.7</b>	<b>16.4%</b>

(source: Office of Admissions, Office of the Registrar)